



---

## 2007 Decisions

## Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

6-21-2007

# Willis v. Besam Automated

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2007](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2007)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Willis v. Besam Automated" (2007). *2007 Decisions*. 901.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2007/901](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2007/901)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2007 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 05-5349

RUTH E. WILLIS,  
Appellant,

v.

BESAM AUTOMATED ENTRANCE SYSTEMS, INC.;  
MARRIOTT INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Appellees.

On Appeal from the Order and Judgment of  
the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
District Judge: Hon. R. Barclay Surrick  
Civ. No. 04-cv-00913

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
June 14, 2007.

Before: McKEE, STAPLETON, and NYGAARD, Circuit Judges

(Opinion Filed: June 21, 2007)

---

OPINION

---

McKEE, Circuit Judge

Ruth E. Willis appeals the District Court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants, Besam Automated Entrance Systems, Inc. and Marriott International, Inc.

Willis is challenging the court's decision to preclude the testimony of her proposed

expert, Ronald Panunto. For the reasons that follow, we will affirm.

Willis's suit stems from an incident that occurred on May 18, 2003. Willis contends that she was injured by the automatic revolving door of the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel in Washington D.C. Since we are writing primarily for the parties, we need not reiterate the factual or procedural history of this case in detail.

In its thorough and well-reasoned opinion, the District Court clearly addressed the arguments Willis is making before us. *See Willis v. Besam*, 2005 WL 2902494 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 3, 2005). The District Court has accurately explained why it was appropriate to reject the expert report that is the focus of this appeal, and there is little we can add to what the District Court has already said.

Accordingly, we will affirm substantially for the reasons set forth by the District Court.